PUBLIC VERSION

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION Washington, D.C.

In the Matter of	-)			
CERTAIN RUBBER ANTIDEGRADANTS, COMPONENTS THEREOF, AND PRODUCTS)))	Investigation No. 337-TA-533	2006	OFC US
CONTAINING SAME	_)		APR	3
Order No. 31: Granting KKPC's Motion To Compel			24 PH	
			42	小温ゴ

On October 11, 2005 respondent Korea Kumho Petrochemical Co., Ltd. (KKPC) moved to compel complainant to produce documents relevant to the licensing and on-sale bar defenses to the patents in issue, and specifically KKPC's Eight Set of Document Request Nos. 226-229, 235, 240, 245, 255 and 256 (Exh. D to motion). (Motion Docket No. 533-43.)

Complainant, in a response dated October 17, 2005, argued that the pending motion should be denied.

No other party responded to the pending motion.

Licensing Defense

KKPC, on its licensing defense, refers to Document Request Nos. 240 and 245 as well as Request Nos. 226, 227, 228, 229 and 256 (See pages 2-3 of supporting memo). Complainant, in opposing KKPC's Motion To Compel, argued that KKPC's licensing defense is a "bogus defense" (memo at 6). However the administrative law judge is not determining, through KKPC's motion to compel, the merits of KKPC's licensing defense. Rather the issue is whether the information sought appears reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence. See Commission rule 210.27(b). Moreover the burden of proving that an issue is beyond

discovery rests squarely with the party resisting the discovery. See Certain Encapsulated

Integrated Circuit Devices and Products Containing Same, Inv. No. 337-TA-501, Order No. 50

(May 18, 2004).

It is not denied that in 1987, complainant's predecessor-in-interest, Monsanto Chemical Company, and KKPC entered into a{

}(Exh. B to motion); that under this{
}Monsanto and KKPC
created Kumho Monsanto, Inc. (KMI) to{
} and that under the terms of the KMI{

} Monsanto provided KMI with{

Complainant argued that the {

}; that any obligation that Monsanto had would have been

}

"limited to{ };" and that Monsanto never } Complainant,

at the hearing, will have the opportunity to establish through evidence such arguments.

However the administrative law judge finds that complainant, in its arguments, has not met its burden in establishing that the requests in issue are beyond discovery. Hence complainant is ordered to fully respond to Document Request Nos. 226, 227, 228, 229, 240, 245 and 256 by the close of business on October 28. If there are no documents in existence, responsive to said requests, complainant should provide a declaration, by October 28, to that effect.

On-Sale Bar Defense

KKPC argued that documents produced by complainant reveal that its purportedly non-

```
commercial "pilot plant" produced{
                    } years prior to the priority date of the '111 patent; that KKPC's manager,
who visited the pilot plant in late 1992, was told by Monsanto personnel working at the pilot
plant that{
                                                                  } that in complainant's pilot
plant manager's deposition, said manager did not dispute this account but stated that he was
unaware of what happened to this{
              }; and that he believed{
                                                               } KKPC argued that it is for this
reason that KKPC seeks shipment and other records of the disposition of said{
        Complainant argued that the purpose of the pilot plant, also known as the
                                                                                              }
plant, was entirely{
                                   } However KKPC is entitled to any documents, if such exist,
that may be inconsistent with said "argument." Hence complainant is ordered to produce, no
later than the close of business on October 28 all documents in existence and responsive to
Document Request Nos. 235 and 255 and which relate in any way to the {
         }
       Complainant argued that it is unclear why KKPC is seeking from complainant what are
"obviously" Monsanto records of the
                                         } If complainant has no documents in issue,
complainant should produce a declaration, no later than October 28, to that effect.
       Motion No. 533-43 is granted.
       On October 18, 2005, each of the private parties and the staff received a copy of this
```

order.

This order will be made public unless a bracketed confidential version is received no later than the close of business on October 28, 2005.

Paul J. Luckern

Administrative Law Judge

Issued: October 18, 2005

CERTAIN RUBBER ANTIDEGRADANTS, COMPONENTS THEREOF, AND PRODUCTS CONTAINING SAME

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Marilyn R. Abbott, hereby certify that the attached **Public Version Order** was served by hand upon Commission Investigative Attorney Juan Cockburn, Esq. and upon the following parties via first class mail, and air mail where necessary, on ______April_26,_2006______.

Marilyn R. Abbott, Secretary

U.S. International Trade Commission

500 E Street, SW - Room 112

Washington, DC 20436

For Complainant Flexsys America LP:

Gregory C. Dorris, Esq. Charles H. Carpenter, Esq. **Pepper Hamilton LLP** Hamilton Square 600 14th Street, NW Washington, DC 20005-2004

Eric C. Cohen, Esq.
Charles R. Krikorian, Esq.
Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP
535 West Monroe Street
Chicago, IL 60661-3693

Gary Ropski

Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione

NBC Tower

455 North Cityfront Plaza

Suite 3600

Chicago, IL 60611

CERTAIN RUBBER ANTIDEGRADANTS, COMPONENTS THEREOF, AND PRODUCTS CONTAINING SAME

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE page 2

For Respondent Korea Kumho Petrochemical Co., Ltd.:

V. James Adduci II Barbara A. Murphy Adduci, Mastriani & Schaumberg, LLP 1200 Seventeenth Street, NW Washington, DC 20036

Robert G. Badal Edward J. Slizewski Heller Ehrman LLP 333 S. Hope Street Suite 3900 Los Angeles, CA 90017-3043

Alan H. Blankenheimer **Heller Ehrman LLP**4350 La Jolla Village Drive, 7th Floor
San Diego, CA 92122

Guy W. Chambers
Maureen Sheehy
Townsend and Townsend and Crew
Two Embarcadero Center
Eighth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111

CERTAIN RUBBER ANTIDEGRADANTS, COMPONENTS THEREOF, AND PRODUCTS CONTAINING SAME

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE page 3

For Respondent Sovereign Chemical Company:

James K. Kearney

Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice LLP

1401 I Street, NW, 7th Floor

Washington, DC 20005

Nanda K. Alapati
Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice LLP
8065 Leesburg Pike, 4th Floor
Tysons Corner, VA 22182-2738

Deborah A. Coleman **Hahn Loeser & Parks LLP**3300 BP Tower
200 Public Square
Cleveland, OH 44114

Scott M. Oldham John J. Cunniff Hahn Loeser & Parks LLP One GOJO Plaza, Suite 300 501 S. Main Street Akron, OH 044311-1076

CERTAIN RUBBER ANTIDEGRADANTS, COMPONENTS THEREOF, AND PRODUCTS CONTAINING SAME

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE page 4

For Respondent Sinorgchem Co., Shandong:

Paul J. Zegger **Arnold & Porter, LLP** 555 12th Street, NW Washington, DC 20004

Shanlon Wu

King and Wood PRC Lawyers
31st Floor, Tower A, Jianwei SOHO,
39 Dongsanhuan Zhonglu
Chaoyang District, Beijing 100022
People's Republic of China

Manni Li **Venable LLP** 575 7th Street, NW Washington, DC 20004

Marcia H. Sundeen, Esq. 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Suite 400 Washington, DC 20006

CERTAIN RUBBER ANTIDEGRADANTS, COMPONENTS THEREOF, AND PRODUCTS CONTAINING SAME

PUBLIC MAILING LIST

Sherry Robinson LEXIS-NEXIS 8891 Gander Creek Drive Miamisburg, OH 45342

Ronnita Green West Group Suite 230 901 Fifteenth Street, NW Washington, DC 20005

(PARTIES NEED NOT SERVE COPIES ON LEXIS OR WEST PUBLISHING)